The Unz Review • An Alternative Media Selection
A Collection of Interesting, Important, and Controversial Perspectives Largely Excluded from the American Mainstream Media

Orthodox Pravda: Christ Is Risen

On the Judaization of Western Christianity and the Orthodox Witness Against It

HIEROMONK NILUS • APRIL 23, 2026 • 13,100 WORDS • 86 COMMENTS

Over the past generation, a current of historical and theological criticism has argued with increasing seriousness that Christianity did not merely absorb Jewish scripture as a preparatory text but was, in its structural logic, shaped by it in ways its adherents have not fully reckoned with. The charge, in its most developed form, runs as follows. By appropriating and universalizing the Hebrew scriptures, the Christian religion became the primary vehicle by which Yahwist metaphysical categories were transmitted to the Gentile nations and came to govern Western civilization: ethnic election, messianic destiny, and the jealous and territorial god of Abraham. The West internalized these structures—guilt before a juridical deity, divine favor as reward for obedience, and the expectation of a temporal redemption in which one people stands at the center of universal history. The result, on this reading, is a civilization organized around the service of Jewish messianic aims while believing itself to be worshipping a universal God of love.

This argument has been made in various forms and with varying degrees of scholarly care. Laurent Guyénot, a French writer, has given it one of its most sustained and innovative treatments in essays published in *The Unz Review*, Substack, and his books *From Yahweh to Zion: Three Thousand Years of Exile* (2018) and, most recently, in *The Papal Curse: The Medieval Origins of Europe's Disunity* (Arktos, 2026). His work merits serious engagement rather than dismissal.

Guyénot's argument moves on two levels. On one level, he advances a historically concrete and evidentially serious case: that the Latin church, through a traceable sequence of theological departures and institutional corruptions, was progressively drawn into the orbit of the tradition it had been formed to supersede—a development with identifiable causes and a dateable origin, set out in detail in *The Papal Curse*. On the other, the same essays press toward a larger claim—that Christianity as such, from its earliest formation, already carried the Jewish imprint, and that the problem is not a historical development but an original condition. Weighed against the

full scope of his own evidence, that bolder claim does not hold. What the evidence most consistently illuminates is a departure within the Latin West, not a corruption inherent to Christianity from its inception. The Orthodox Tradition is not introduced here as a counterexample arranged to answer him; it precedes his very question. It sustained the apostolic inheritance through every assault directed against it and produced across those same centuries persons in whom the uncreated life was visibly present.

Guyénot's analysis is substantially correct in what it diagnoses, but it misidentifies the patient. The parasite of Judaization he describes has indeed occurred. Its host, however, is the schismatic Western Christianity that emerged in the centuries following the Filioque, and above all its modern Protestant and evangelical expressions. The Orthodox Tradition has not been its habitat; it has always known what the enemy is, named it plainly, and understood itself as standing against it. What follows provides a framework for clarifying and extending Guyénot's analysis, which is often strong and innovative, but ultimately misdirected.

I. Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy

Guyénot's most consequential analytical error is treating "Christianity" as a single, coherent historical phenomenon. His own evidence does not sustain the premise. Modern Protestantism —especially in its evangelical dispensational form—and the hesychast tradition of Mount Athos do not share the same theological commitments, and the same biblical text read without its Christological key is not, in any functional sense, the same book. To treat these as variants of a single religion is to misidentify the subject of analysis from the outset.

What separates them is a historical divergence that runs to the foundations. The Orthodox Tradition reads the Old Testament as a Christological economy fulfilled and superseded in the Incarnation, every theophany a preparation for the moment when God became man. Modern Protestantism came to read the same text as a living charter of ethnic election, its covenants still operative and its land grants still enforceable. At stake are the nature of grace, the meaning of salvation, and the kind of relation that can exist between the human person and God.

In the Orthodox understanding, salvation is the restoration of the human person through *theosis*: genuine participation in the uncreated divine life, an ontological transformation made possible by the Incarnation. What man lost in the fall was not legal standing before a divine judge but the capacity for direct communion with God—the darkening of the *nous*, the faculty through which man knows God immediately. The ascetic and sacramental life of the Church exists to restore that capacity. As Vladimir Lossky wrote, East and West came to embody "two different dogmatic attitudes, irreconcilable on several points". In the East, that divergence takes its clearest form in one governing conviction: salvation is deification, not acquittal.

In the West, once the Filioque had severed the theological foundation of genuine deification, grace came to be conceived as a created effect of divine action rather than God's direct self-communication, and salvation accordingly as a change in legal standing, a forgiveness of debt, a satisfaction of what the divine law demands. Two traditions organized around opposed conceptions of God's nature and man's destiny could not long remain variants of one religion.

Saint Seraphim of Sarov communed with the uncreated Light in a forest cell. Valeriu Gafencu died in a Communist prison with the Jesus Prayer on his lips and the Mother of God at his bedside. Such men are the characteristic fruit of the tradition that formed them—the kind of person it exists to make. In its evangelical dispensational form, Western Christianity has produced Christian Zionism: Gentile nations organized to serve a Jewish nationalist project, their governments funding ethnic cleansing in the name of biblical prophecy. One understands salvation to be a change in being; the other, a change in geopolitical alignment. The civilizations follow accordingly.

The same contrast answers the argument Guyénot develops in his essay "The Vampire of the Empire"—drawing on Nietzsche, Renan, and Peter Brown's account in *The Rise of Western Christendom* of the fourth- and fifth-century religious civil wars—that Christianity destroyed Roman civilization by redirecting civic energy toward theological fanaticism. The case has real force against the post-Nicene Western Church, which did drive those wars with lethal intolerance, conscripting barbarians against Romans in the service of doctrinal conformity. Guyénot himself acknowledges the objection that cannot be answered from within his thesis: the Eastern Empire outlasted the West by a millennium under a more fully Christian order. Constantinople preserved Roman law, Roman civilization, and theological continuity in unbroken succession for a thousand years after Rome's fall.

II. The Theological Root: How the West Departed

The Filioque is the precise theological innovation by which the Latin tradition lost the framework that held the patristic inheritance together. It was not a verbal quarrel but the hinge on which Western Christianity swung away from everything that had kept it structurally resistant to the Yahwist project.

The historical rupture

The Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed of 381 confesses the Holy Spirit as proceeding "from the Father." The Second Ecumenical Council established this; the Third explicitly forbade its alteration. In the ninth century, the Frankish church inserted *et Filio*, "and the Son," without conciliar authority. Pope Leo III had the Creed engraved on silver tablets in Rome without the Filioque to register his opposition. By 1014, under political pressure from the Frankish regime, the papacy capitulated.

The theological mechanism

Saint Gregory Palamas (1296–1359), in his *Apodictic Treatises on the Procession of the Holy Spirit*, demonstrated that this was a structural heresy, not a verbal one. He identified its source in characteristically unsparing terms: the subtle serpent, working through the Latins, had introduced innovations that "seem to make but a small change" while creating "the occasion for many evils," things "subtle, foreign to piety, and logically absurd." If the Spirit proceeds from both Father and Son, the grace it communicates becomes, in the West's scholastic development, a created instrumental effect of divine action rather than God's direct self-communication. Palamas's distinction between the divine essence, which is absolutely

incommunicable, and the divine energies, which are genuinely God Himself operative in creation, is what makes *theosis* conceivable—holding together the claim that man cannot become God by nature with the claim that man genuinely participates in God by grace, without collapsing into either pantheism or deism. Once that distinction is lost within a theological tradition, genuine *theosis* becomes structurally unavailable to it, a necessary consequence of the framework it has accepted.

Archimandrite George, Abbot of the Holy Monastery of Saint Gregorios on Mount Athos, articulates in *Theosis: The True Purpose of Human Life* why Western rationalism cannot recover this ground from within its own resources. Western thinkers, he observes, "cannot accept" the patristic account of deification because, "being rationalists, they do not discern between the essence and the energy of God." Without the distinction, there is no conceptual space between the claim that man communes with God and the claim that man becomes God in His substance, and the West is therefore forced into one of two positions: the denial of genuine deification, or the affirmation of a mystical union so heavily qualified as to be indistinguishable from moral progress. Both outcomes are visible in the Western tradition. The medieval mystical tradition, from Bernard to Eckhart, circles around the problem without resolving it, and the Reformation's rejection of mysticism in favor of forensic justification completes what the scholastic framework had already made difficult to avoid. Andrew Stephen Damick, in *Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy*, draws out the pastoral consequence: the Palamite distinction is what allows Orthodoxy to maintain that salvation rescues us "not only from the guilt of sin, but from the very power of sin and death"—a change in actual being, not merely in legal status. Without it, salvation is external to the person: a verdict pronounced, a debt cancelled, a standing restored.

The collapse of mystical theology

Lossky observed that the Eastern Tradition had never separated mysticism from theology or personal experience from dogma, because in the Orthodox understanding they are the same reality approached from different angles. The Filioque dissolves this unity within the Latin tradition, producing what Lossky calls two traditions "opposed, one to another." Florovsky (1893–1979) traced the practical consequence into the history of Western thought: since the rise of Scholasticism, patristic theology had become in the West "a kind of archaic prelude," a judgment that many in the East had "most unfortunately" accepted "blindly and uncritically." The loss of the patristic framework was not immediately visible even to those who should have recognized it; the categories of Scholasticism had become so dominant that theology conducted in patristic terms appeared, from within those categories, as merely pre-scientific. The shift is not terminological but conditional: it concerns the very prerequisites under which genuine theology becomes possible. Florovsky's further judgment—that from within Augustinian presuppositions the whole hesychast edifice becomes "unacceptable and absurd"—identifies the epistemological consequence: the two traditions cannot argue with each other on shared ground, because they no longer share the anthropological premises about what man is and what communion with God makes possible for him.

Meyendorff (1926–1992) pressed the point into the question of salvation itself. If the divine life genuinely becomes available to purified human souls, then salvation is, as he put it, "actually

becoming God." The Latin tradition arrived instead at a framework in which grace is a created intermediate between God and man, the soul receives effects rather than the giver, and the relation between God and man remains a correspondence between two parties rather than a communion between natures. The juridical metaphor became the characteristic expression of that framework because, once genuine participation in the life of God is no longer available to the soul, transaction is the only grammar salvation has left.

Institutional and intellectual consequences

The institutional consequences of this theological shift are direct and traceable. A Church that replaces the uncreated divine life with a created legal effect will tend to organize itself around the dispensation of legal effects. The Donation of Constantine—a fabrication by which the papacy claimed temporal authority over the western Roman Empire, underwriting eight centuries of political structures before Lorenzo Valla exposed it in the fifteenth century—is the most visible expression of this logic. The Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, fabricated in the ninth century to justify papal supremacy over other bishops, furnished the legal architecture within which the papacy operated throughout the medieval period. In *The Papal Curse*, Guyénot identifies something "Levitical" in the papal authoritarian legalism of the Gregorian Reform. Once the juridical metaphor governs the soul's relation to God, the same metaphor governs the Church's relation to the world; the forgeries served a framework the Filioque had already made conceivable.

The intellectual consequences run deeper still. Moses Maimonides (1138–1204) died without achieving the synthesis of faith and reason the Latin scholastic tradition required. Thomas Aquinas drew substantially from the *Guide for the Perplexed* in constructing the Thomistic synthesis that became the intellectual foundation of Latin Christianity. Maimonides had developed the most rigorous available account of a God who is pure essence, absolutely simple, accessible to man only through the operations of reason and the mediation of an impersonal intellectual overflow—precisely the kind of God that a tradition without the essence/energies distinction needs. The scholastic theology that displaced patristic *theosis* in the West was thus shaped, in significant part, by the very tradition it ostensibly superseded. When salvation becomes a matter of intellectual assent to propositions about a God whose inner life remains inaccessible, and theology becomes the systematic organization of revealed data rather than the fruit of a life of prayer, the intellectual ancestry of the system begins to explain a great deal about its character. The Greek Fathers understood theology as a capacity reached through purification; the scholastic tradition understood it as a discipline learned by disputation. The two methods are not directed toward the same object.

That distinction directly engages what Guyénot, drawing on Mark Letteney's *The Christianization of Knowledge in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, 2023), identifies as the Judaization of the Western intellectual tradition: the post-Nicene scholarly method of aggregating and distilling authoritative texts into binding formulas—a method whose structural resemblance to Talmudic reasoning, Letteney argues, is not accidental—sterilized the inquisitive Hellenic spirit for a millennium. The observation is not without foundation. But the tradition that made theology a matter of textual authority and doctrinal disputation was the Latin scholastic tradition, not the hesychast one. The hesychast method cultivates the faculty

through which God is directly known; it aggregates nothing. Florovsky's judgment that the two traditions cannot share epistemological premises is the precise answer to this claim: what Letteney identifies as the Christianization of Western knowledge is better described as its Scholasticization—a specifically Western departure, not a property of the faith.

III. How the Latin Church Was Infiltrated by Jews

The protections the Orthodox Tradition maintained—the Quinisext canons, the homilies of Chrysostom received by the Church as binding—were not incidental to its life but the institutional form of what it understood the post-Incarnation synagogue to be. Once that understanding was abandoned, the protections fell with it, and what followed came through Christianity itself rather than around it.

The Gregorian Reform and the Crusades

Robert Moore, whose work Guyénot draws upon extensively in *The Papal Curse*, called the Gregorian Reform "the first European revolution"—"a radical, global and irreversible transformation of society." What the reformers transformed, at its root, was the economy of grace itself. A church that had already replaced the uncreated divine life with created legal effects required an accounting system to administer them: sin became debt, penance its repayment, and absolution a transaction. The word "redemption" encodes this logic in its Latin etymology—*redimere*, "buying back"—and the Gregorian reformers made it structural. Pope Gregory VII's *Dictatus papae* claimed that all princes must kiss his feet alone and that the pope could depose emperors at will; Dostoevsky captured what this represented when he wrote that Roman Catholicism had "proclaimed a new Christ, not like the former one, but one who has been seduced by the third temptation of the devil—the temptation of the kingdoms of the world." Guyénot in *The Papal Curse* is not exaggerating when he calls the institution built on this foundation an "institution of spiritual credit": the Crusades formalized the logic by making military service a form of penal remission, salvation its wage. Their final expression was the Fourth Crusade of 1204, which destroyed the one Christian civilization that had preserved the inheritance the West had already abandoned. The capacity to undertake that destruction reveals what the Latin church had by then become.

The economic opening

Within this institutional framework, a specific economic vulnerability opened. The Church's canonical prohibition on usury created in medieval Europe a role that could be filled only by those not bound by it. The financial functions of a Christian society were therefore assumed, over time, by those who operated outside its moral law. Jewish communities acquired a substantial monopoly on lending at interest, at rates far exceeding what Christian canon law permitted. The canons of the Quinisext Council in Trullo had prescribed exactly the boundaries whose removal created this exposure, prohibiting clergy and laity from eating unleavened bread with Jews, receiving medicines from them, bathing with them, or entering a synagogue to pray. These canons expressed a theological judgment: the post-Incarnation synagogue is a place where God is not worshipped, and intercourse with it endangers the grace of Baptism. The

Latin church, having abandoned these protections along with the theology that grounded them, was laid open to the infiltration against which its own tradition had always warned.

The Marrano infiltration

The Marrano episode is the central case, and its theological dimension is what makes it more than a story of social mobility. The forced mass conversions in Spain and Portugal beginning in 1391, culminating in the 1492 expulsion and the Inquisition, produced what Guyénot documents, drawing on Yirmiyahu Yovel's history of Marranism, as one of the most consequential episodes in the religious history of the West. Freed from the legal restrictions that had previously bounded Jewish public life, the *conversos* or *marranos* reached within two generations the royal councils of Castile and Aragon, the command of the army and navy, and all ecclesiastical offices from parish priest to bishop and cardinal. The penetration extended into the Counter-Reformation itself: Ignatius of Loyola (1491–1556) came from a Marrano family, and the Jesuit order's earliest membership was disproportionately *converso*. But the social ascent is less significant than what Guyénot finds in the writings of Alonso Cartagena, Bishop of Burgos and son of the converted chief rabbi Solomon Halevi.

Cartagena argued that Jewish conversion to Christianity was not truly conversion at all. The converted Jew was a superior Christian because he had not changed faiths but deepened the one he already possessed; the Gentile, by contrast, first had to purge himself of paganism before he could receive what the Jew had inherited by birth. The Jews were "a natural aristocracy of humanity" whose preeminence persisted through baptism—it was the Gentile church that depended on Jewish grace, not the reverse. Analytically, this is the wholesale inversion of the Gospel: the conclusion that the Incarnation had not fulfilled but merely extended Jewish privilege to an inferior class of beneficiaries. That a bishop of the Latin church could articulate this without apparent awareness of what he was saying is itself the evidence: a man so thoroughly shaped by an alien theological inheritance that it had displaced his own. Only a church that had already abandoned the apostolic framework could have generated such a figure, let alone elevated him. A church with Saint John Chrysostom's homilies still binding in its life and the Quinisext canons intact would have possessed the instruments to name and refuse him. The Latin church, having forfeited both, did not.

Guyénot's essay "Is Christianity the Whore of Israel?" frames the structural logic of this vulnerability in terms of the Rahab of Jericho—the harlot who opens the Gentile city's gates to the invaders by acknowledging the god of Israel as the universal God. The danger is real. But the tradition that kept the Christological reading of the Old Covenant also kept the gate shut. Rahab opened what she did not hold, and the Latin church, having abandoned the key, became the figure Guyénot describes. The Orthodox East never did.

The Reformation and its consequences

The Reformation attempted to correct Rome's corruptions and succeeded only in accelerating the underlying dynamic. Luther's insight that the indulgence trade was the logical conclusion of a corrupt theology was genuine. His remedy—placing the individual conscience before the open Bible and elevating the status of the Old Testament—created what Guyénot calls "the Trojan

horse of Yahwism within Christianity," launching what he characterizes as "an irreversible return to Judaism." Within modern Protestantism, Calvinist covenant theology provided the framework for this return, reading the promises to Abraham as literal ethnic and territorial guarantees still operative in the contemporary world. Into this environment Portuguese Marranos arrived in England between 1630 and 1650, finding in Calvinist refugees natural interlocutors; by 1650 they possessed a twelfth of all English commerce. Some Puritans went beyond admiration into practical Judaizing, circumcising their children, keeping the Sabbath with rabbinical rigor, and treating the Levitical laws as binding. Isaac d'Israeli (1766–1848) observed that under Charles I it seemed "that religion chiefly consisted of Sabbatarian rigours; and that a British senate had been transformed into a company of Hebrew Rabbins." Christian Zionism is not an aberration of Calvinist covenant theology; it is where that theology was always going to arrive.

The secularized continuation

What the Reformation accelerated, the intellectual movements of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries carried into fully secular form. Gershom Scholem (1897–1982), in *Sabbatai Ṣevi: The Mystical Messiah*, documented how the theological response to Sabbatai Sevi's apostasy produced "redemption through sin," culminating in Jacob Frank's (1726–1791) mass Torah violation and eventual mass baptism—what Scholem called "kabbalistic nihilism." From this tradition, as David Bakan demonstrated in *Sigmund Freud and the Jewish Mystical Tradition* (1958), Freud drew the essential impulse of psychoanalysis: a secularization of the Sabbatian program, grappling as a "scientific problem" with what that movement had expressed as "emotional and social Messianism." Freud himself acknowledged that psychoanalysis "could only have been created by a Jew," and wrote to Oskar Pfister asking why it had required "a godless Jew" to devise it. Eliza Slavet, in *Racial Fever* (2009), demonstrates that in *Moses and Monotheism* Freud developed a theory of cultural transmission through inherited memory-traces; his associate Yerushalmi asked directly whether Freud had come to see psychoanalysis as "a sort of godless Judaism, a 'Jewish science' for the future." Kevin MacDonald's *The Culture of Critique* (1998) situates this within a broader pattern: Freudian psychology, Boasian anthropology, and the Frankfurt School functioning as instruments for dissolving the inherited cultural order of the Christian West. What links these movements is not coordination but a shared orientation, made possible by the long collapse described in the preceding pages.

IV. Scripture and the Fathers on the Jewish Question

The Orthodox Tradition did not arrive at its understanding of the Jewish Question through historical analysis, but through Scripture: what Scripture establishes, the Fathers interpret, and the councils formalize into canon law. These are not three separate authorities converging on the same conclusion but three moments in a single continuous theological judgment, never revoked.

Scripture

The theological ground from which everything else proceeds is Johannine in character. When the Apostle John writes "In the beginning was the Logos," he does something that E. Michael

Jones, in *Logos Rising* (2020), describes as composing a second Genesis: joining Hebrew cosmology to Greek metaphysics and naming as a historical person the rational principle on which the universe is ordered. A community organized around the explicit rejection of this claim is not one where God is worshipped. Christ states this plainly: "If you were to know my Father, you would also know me. But you neither know me nor do you know my Father" (John 8:19). He names the consequence of that rejection without qualification: "You are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father it is your will to do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and he stood not in the truth, because there is no truth in him" (John 8:44). Paul confirms the judgment across the Pauline mission. City by city, he preaches in the synagogue and is expelled. His declaration in Corinth—"Your blood be upon your own heads; I am clean: from henceforth I will go unto the Gentiles" (Acts 18:6)—is not a frustrated gesture but a theological verdict, one the Book of Revelation echoes in naming "the synagogue of Satan, which say they are Jews, and are not" (Revelation 2:9).

The Old Testament is legible within this framework only through its Christological key. Christopher Veniamin, Professor of Patristics at Saint Tikhon's Orthodox Theological Seminary, articulates what every major Father understood: every significant Old Testament encounter with God is an encounter with the pre-incarnate Son. The three men at Mamre, the figure who wrestled with Jacob at Peniel, the Angel of the Lord at the burning bush—these are not preparatory sketches of a God who would later be revealed but appearances of the one already present. The rabbinical reading that routes around Christ takes a text whose entire coherence depends on its Christological fulfillment and refashions it as the foundation for a post-Christian ethnic and religious project. This is precisely what the Fathers identified it as doing.

Guyénot presses a further claim, developed in his essay "Hacking the Logos": that the Logos Christology of the Fourth Gospel derives not from Greek philosophy but from Philo of Alexandria, whose synthesis of Torah and Middle Platonism supplied the conceptual framework on which early Christian apologists built—Justin Martyr drew directly from Philo, and Erwin Goodenough confirmed the debt. The historical contact is real; the conclusion Guyénot draws from it is not. Philo identified Moses as a near-perfect manifestation of the Logos and understood that principle as the divine intermediary whose function was to preserve God's transcendence by keeping him at a safe distance from matter and from any particular historical moment. What the Gospel of John claims is precisely what Philo's entire system was constructed to prevent: that the Logos became one man, in one place, executed under Roman law, and rose from the dead. The claim demolishes the function the Philonic Logos was designed to serve. The Logos of the Fourth Gospel does not extend or deepen Philo's framework; it detonates it from within. To have borrowed a vocabulary and then used it to assert the exact opposite of what the vocabulary was meant to protect is not Judaization—it is the argument of the Incarnation conducted in Alexandrian terms. The language was Philonic, but the meaning was its inversion.

Chrysostom

The fullest patristic treatment of the Jewish question is Saint John Chrysostom's eight homilies *Against the Jews* (*Adversus Judaeos*), preached in Antioch around 386–387. The occasion was a pastoral emergency: baptized Christians were attending Jewish festivals, consulting Jewish

healers, and swearing oaths at synagogues. Chrysostom does not treat this as cultural curiosity. He opens with a medical question—"What is this disease?"—and answers with a precise theological diagnosis: entrusted with the preparation for the Messiah, the Jews crucified him when he came and continue performing the outward observances given precisely to prepare them for him. The preparation is complete; yet they reject it. Their feasts are therefore not the feasts of God but of demons, and the Christian who participates risks his soul. The synagogue is a place God has forsaken, and when God forsakes a place, demons take possession. "In their synagogue stands an invisible altar of deceit on which they sacrifice not sheep and calves but the souls of men." The pastoral instruction follows: restrain any Christian drawn toward the synagogue; use force if necessary. Chrysostom is applying the Johannine premise to the question of post-Incarnation Jewish worship: "No Jew adores God! Who say so? The Son of God say so."

The patristic continuity

Saint John Chrysostom stands at the center of a continuous tradition, not as an exceptional voice within it. Saint Melito of Sardis (died c. 180), preaching at the Pascha, addressed Israel directly: "He who hung the earth is hanged; He who fixed the heavens has been fixed… the King of Israel has been slain by an Israelitish right hand." Saint Justin Martyr (c. 100–165) argued in the *Dialogue with Trypho* that the true spiritual Israel consists of those led to God through the crucified Christ. Tertullian (c. 155–240) traced supersessionism through the whole arc of sacred history—circumcision a temporal sign, the Sabbath a temporal ordinance, the sacrifices typological anticipations of the one oblation—showing that the Law was given for a time now complete. Origen (c. 185–253) inverted the charge that Christianity had appropriated Jewish scriptures without claim: the destruction of Jerusalem was punishment for no sin "so severe as for those committed against our Jesus." From the first generation to the fourth century, on the question of what the rejection of Christ means, the patristic Tradition speaks with one voice.

This patristic unanimity is the direct answer to Guyénot's argument that Christianity's sanctification of the Hebrew scriptures perpetuates Jewish theological authority. The Fathers did not receive the Old Testament as an operative religious document; they read it as a Christological archive—every covenant and theophany closed and superseded in the one to whom it had been pointing from the beginning. To hold a text as fulfilled is to hold it as completed. The Jewish reading of the Tanakh is the reading of a text that remains open and active; the patristic reading is of a text that has delivered its meaning and ceded its authority to the one it prepared. These are not the same kind of relationship to the same document. Patristic exegesis is the antithesis of Judaization precisely because it refuses the Jewish reading of the Jewish text on the Jewish text's own ground—which is exactly why Chrysostom's homilies were necessary, and why the councils encoded their conclusions into law.

The canonical confirmation

The Quinisext Council in Trullo (692) translated this patristic consensus into the operative law of the Church. Canon 11 prohibits any cleric or layman from eating the unleavened bread of the Jews, having familiar intercourse with them, summoning them in illness, receiving medicines

from them, or bathing with them—"but if any one shall take in hand to do this, if he be a cleric, let him be deposed, but if a layman let him be cut off." Canon 70 requires deposition of any bishop, presbyter, or deacon who keeps fast or festival with the Jews or receives gifts from their feasts. These canons have never been revoked. The Synodikon of Orthodoxy, proclaimed on the first Sunday of Great Lent every year, names Saint John Chrysostom explicitly among the Holy Fathers to whom eternal memory is given, and anathematizes those who reject the grace of redemption preached by the Gospel as the only means of justification before God. What the councils did was to codify what Scripture had uttered and the Fathers had already enforced.

V. What Their Tradition Teaches About Itself

Guyénot's thesis encounters its clearest difficulty in the primary sources of the rabbinical tradition itself. If Christianity were a Jewish evolutionary strategy successfully installed as the dominant religion of Western civilization, one would expect Judaism to regard it with at least instrumental favor. The documentary record, as this section enumerates, suggests the opposite.

Shahak and the Mishneh Torah

The clearest window into rabbinical self-understanding was opened by Israel Shahak (1933–2001), a professor at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, who spent decades comparing primary rabbinical texts in editions produced before the sixteenth-century censorship program with those produced after it. His method was systematic: identify what was changed or removed, and report what the originals said. What he found in Maimonides's *Mishneh Torah*, the most authoritative codification of Jewish law ever produced, was unambiguous. A Jew who causes the death of a Gentile through indirect means has committed no sin. A Gentile seen drowning need not be rescued, because the commandment against standing against the blood of one's neighbor applies only to one's neighbor—"a Gentile is not thy neighbour." These are not marginal positions; they appear in the central legal text of the tradition. The military application was stated without embarrassment in a 1973 pamphlet from the Central Region Command of the Israeli army, *Tohar Ha-Neshek* ("The Purity of Weapons"), which declared it "permitted and indeed obligatory according to the Halakha" to kill Arab civilians who appear harmless when Israeli forces are advancing.

The Talmudic record on Christianity

On Christianity, Shahak concluded that Judaism is permeated by "a very deep hatred of Christianity, combined with complete ignorance of it"—a contempt present when Christianity was still a persecuted sect within the Roman Empire, predating any Christian persecution of Jews. The Talmudic record is explicit. *Sanhedrin* 43a states that Jesus of Nazareth was executed because he "practiced sorcery, incited and led Israel astray." The classical sources, Shahak notes, "are very happy to take responsibility for it; in the Talmudic account the Romans are not even mentioned." *BT Gittin* 57a places Jesus in hell, boiling in excrement. The Virgin Mary is referred to in Talmudic literature as a harlot. The name *Yeshu*, used wherever Jesus appears in rabbinical texts, is an acronym for *yimach shemo vezikhro*, "may his name and memory be blotted out." Johann Andreas Eisenmenger (1654–1704), whose *Entdecktes Judenthum* (1700) was the first systematic scholarly compilation of anti-Christian passages

from rabbinical literature, had documented this material two and a half centuries before Shahak, with full tractate citations. His work was suppressed through diplomatic pressure on the Holy Roman Emperor and never refuted through engagement with the sources.

The Protocols as Comparison

It is against this backdrop that *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* demands consideration as a comparative text. Readers of *The Unz Review* will require no introduction to the document or to its controversial history; nonetheless, a brief contextual note serves the argument that follows. Sergei Nilus brought the Protocols into wide circulation at the turn of the twentieth century. The document proposes a coordinated, global Jewish cabal, employing financial power, control of the press, and ideological subversion to achieve dominion over the Gentile nations—and yet, it's widely regarded as a forgery. What is striking is how closely its specific claims mirror what the Talmudic sources establish on their own.

Protocol 1 describes the Gentile nations as "a flock of sheep" incapable of self-governance, to be managed by a superior intelligence—a posture the halakhic tradition had long given legal form. Protocol 4 identifies Christianity as the primary civilizational obstacle to Jewish dominion and calls for its dissolution through materialism and the sowing of doubt; the Talmudic record testifies to the same animus as settled doctrine, maintained from the period when Christianity was a persecuted minority with no power to threaten anyone. Protocol 9 grounds the enterprise in a divinely ordained chosenness that places the Jewish people categorically above the nations —the same warrant the Mishneh Torah codifies on its own authority. The Protocols transposed into political language what the theological texts had said, in detail and without apology, for centuries.

The concealment history

When the printing press made Talmudic literature accessible to Christian scholars in the sixteenth century, the rabbinical response was not revision but concealment. The word *goy* was replaced in European editions with "idolater," "Canaanite," or "Samaritan," making hostile passages appear to address ancient pagans rather than contemporary Christians. After the establishment of the State of Israel, when political security no longer required concealment, the passages were restored without comment or apology. Shahak's assessment was direct: "All of this was from beginning to end a calculated lie."

The theological interpretation

The conflict is explicit, but the two sides frame it differently: the rabbinical tradition as opposition between the people of God and an apostate sect, the Christian tradition as the conflict between the Logos and its rejection. Both recognize that a conflict exists. What Shahak and Eisenmenger document is the posture of an adversary, not the solicitude of a maker for his artifact.

E. Michael Jones develops the theological dimensions of this conflict across two works. In *The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit* (2008), he argues that once the Jews defined a suffering Christ as a contradiction in terms, the rejection of the Logos became not an incidental position but an

organizing principle. In *Logos Rising* (2020), he traces a consistent trajectory from the Zealots through the Marxist revolutionary tradition to the Frankfurt School's assault on Western cultural norms, arguing that a theological analysis explains this consistency where a purely political one cannot. Thomas Dalton, in *Eternal Strangers* (2020), gives the argument its required historical range: a documented record of adversarial engagement between Jewish communities and their host populations from ancient Egypt through Roman imperial law to the modern period. A pattern this consistent across communities separated by millennia and continents demands a structural account; the theological one—that the rejection of the Logos produces an adversarial orientation toward every civilization organized around its affirmation—is the account the evidence actually fits.

VI. What Orthodoxy Is: A Way of Life

Orthodoxy is not a doctrinal system, but a complete way of life: an ascetical, sacramental, and liturgical formation aimed at healing the human person and restoring him to communion with God. The word *therapy* here carries none of its modern clinical associations—least of all those bequeathed by the Freudian school, which, as the preceding sections have documented, represents not a parallel healing science but the precise inversion of one, a counterfeit that addresses the symptoms of a fallen soul while deepening its captivity. When Metropolitan Hierotheos of Nafpaktos, in *Orthodox Psychotherapy: The Science of the Fathers*, declares that "Christianity, and especially Orthodoxy, is therapy," he is making a formal claim about the nature of Orthodoxy as the only coherent account of what ails the human person and the only tradition possessing the means to cure it—specific in its diagnosis, graduated in its method, and grounded in the experience of those who have undergone it across twenty centuries.

The diagnosis

The disease to be treated is the darkening and captivity of the *nous*. Metropolitan Hierotheos, following the patristic consensus, describes the fall in medical rather than legal terms: "The ancestral sin is that man withdrew from God, lost divine grace, and this resulted in blindness, darkness and death of the *nous*." Subjected to the turbulence of the passions, the *nous* can no longer see God, though it was made for nothing else. Every practice of the ascetic life exists to prepare it for its cure, and the cure itself is nothing other than the restoration of direct communion with God.

The three stages

The patristic tradition articulates this cure in three stages. Saint Maximus the Confessor (c. 580–662) provides the classical formulation: *praxis*, the purification of the heart through ascetic labor; *theoria*, the illumination of the *nous* that follows; and *theosis* itself, the direct and unmediated communion with God that the first two stages make possible. These are not separate programs but phases of a single healing movement: the first prepares the organ, the second begins to see, the third participates in what is seen. Saint Athanasius the Great (c. 296–373) stated the ground of this process: "He assumed humanity that we might become God." Saint Maximus extended it: "the person who has been deified by grace will be in every respect as God is, except for His very essence." Archimandrite George, Abbot of the Holy Monastery of

Saint Gregorios on Mount Athos, is unambiguous that these words carry their full weight. Theosis is "personal communion with God face to face," and the Creator, "God by nature, calls man to become a god by grace"—not as an exaggeration, but as the direct implication of Christ's own words: "You are gods" and "be perfect as your Father in heaven is perfect."

The Church is the hospital, the priest the physician, the sacraments the medicine, the ascetic life the regimen, and *theosis* the state of health toward which the whole is directed. The whole is internally coherent—not as a poetic alternative to forensic categories but as their replacement, grounded in a different anthropology, a different doctrine of grace, and a different understanding of what the fall produced.

The struggle against the passions

Within this framework, the struggle against the passions is clinical rather than moral. Saint Ignatius Brianchaninov (1807–1867), in *The Field: Cultivating Salvation*, describes the passions as "sinful diseases of the body and soul," symptoms of a nature fallen from its proper orientation toward God. The ascetic life is therefore a sustained resistance: "Every time you resist the insistent desires of the passion, they weaken in you. Constant resistance destroys the passion. Every time you fall to the passion it becomes stronger." Elder Ephraim of Arizona adds the necessary precision: the heart is "entangled with the prickly roots of various passions, which are lodged very deep within it." When a person attempts to uproot a passion, he lacerates the heart in the process—it bleeds and hurts. Those who cannot bear the pain abandon the work; those who endure remove the root and are set free.

Prayer and inner discipline

The inner discipline of prayer follows the same logic. Brianchaninov insists that the mind during prayer must be kept entirely free of images, "because the mind in prayer is standing before the invisible God, Whom it is impossible to imagine in any visible form." Images become "an opaque veil, a wall between the mind and God," and a soul led by imagination will, he warns, "become invariably fooled and be seriously spiritually damaged." The issue is not technique but the nature of the organ through which God is received—a difference that explains why Western devotional practice, with its reliance on visualization and emotional states, cannot produce what the hesychast tradition produces.

Saint Theophan the Recluse (1815–1894), in *The Path to Salvation*, names the final goal as "living unity with God"—an ontological state in which the Holy Spirit inhabits a soul purified through sustained ascetic labor. The patristic chain he assembles is unbroken: Saint Diadochus of Photiki wrote that "if a man, while still alive, can undergo death through his labors, then in his entirety he becomes the dwelling-place of the Holy Spirit"; Saint Macarius the Great wrote that after long trials the work of grace "shows itself fully, and the soul acquires full sonship of the Spirit—man is made worthy to be of one spirit with the Lord." Grace works at first as "a mother who hides from her children," then returns openly when the soul has proven itself, until divine love burns away the passions entirely, producing what Saint John Climacus defined as passionlessness: "the resurrection of the soul before the body."

Hesychasm in practice

The hesychast tradition is *theosis* in practice. The Jesus Prayer—"Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, have mercy upon me, a sinner"—repeated in coordination with the breath and descending into the heart, purifies the *nous* of discursive thought and produces the stillness in which the uncreated divine energies are received. Saint Gregory Palamas established against the scholastic objections of Barlaam that the light seen on Tabor was not a created symbol but the uncreated energy of God, genuinely distinct from the divine essence and genuinely accessible to man. The councils of 1341, 1347, and 1351 confirmed this, and it was enshrined in the Synodikon of Orthodoxy in 1368—not as a late development, but as the formal affirmation of what the tradition had always practiced.

Saint Symeon the New Theologian (949–1022) stated the criterion plainly: those who have not seen the uncreated light have not seen God, and those who have not received it have not received grace. Saint Seraphim of Sarov (1754–1833) expressed the same truth with equal clarity: "The true end of the Christian life is the acquiring of the Holy Spirit of God." Saint Nikolai Velimirović (1880–1956), in *The Prologue of Ohrid*, transmits this in its daily form: "With closest custody, guard your heart… Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God." The guarding of the heart is the concrete discipline that binds the theology of Saint Gregory Palamas to the lived experience of man in his becoming.

The modern witness

Fr. Justin Popović (1894–1979), writing under house arrest, articulated what this tradition stands against: the modern West has not merely declined from Christianity but replaced its object, exchanging the God who became man so that man might become God for a man who declares himself sufficient without the Incarnation. "European humanism," he wrote, "is nothing other than a new religion with man as its god." His monastery, regarded by the state as subversive, was precisely that: a place where the human person was still understood in the light of the Incarnation.

Fr. Seraphim Rose (1934–1982) understood the stakes in their most immediate form. His answer to the claim that all spiritual paths are equivalent: "No! We do not have the same God that those outside the Christian faith have!… Our God is a God Incarnate, Whom we have seen with our eyes, and our hands have touched." The story he recounts of a disciple of Saint Paisius gives this its force. The disciple, challenged on the road by a Jew on the existence of Christ, wavered for a moment and said: "Perhaps what you say is correct." When he returned, the saint told him that the grace of Baptism had left him. One moment of interior wavering, and the condition was gone. The story bears upon ontology: *theosis* is a state of the soul, acquired at cost and preserved only by vigilance, and the Tradition exists to preserve what vigilance alone will not sustain.

VII. The Witness of Blood: Romania, Russia, and Palestine

Three cases bring the argument into the register of blood. Romania shows Orthodox resistance in its explicitly ascetical and spiritual form—a people who met hostile power through the

formation of a new man grounded in the hesychast tradition. Russia is the apex case: not unique in kind, since every Orthodox nation under Communist rule faced a version of the same assault, but unique in scale and duration. Palestine is the instance still unfolding, where the Talmudic principles already documented pass into direct military application, and where the difference between traditions that kept the apostolic inheritance and those that lost it becomes ever more visible in their response to the destruction of innocent life.

Romania

Corneliu Zelea Codreanu (1899–1938) founded the Legion of the Archangel Michael on explicitly Orthodox grounds—a defense of Christian Romania against what he understood as the spirit of the lie operating through the institutions of Jewish political and financial power. Eugen Weber, assessing his thought, found it "of a completely different essence than those of other social European movements, his being more inclined towards Christianity, simpler than the ideologies of the West, and yet, more subtle when taking into consideration more issues that were elsewhere ignored."

In *For My Legionaries*, Codreanu reproduces and endorses the analysis of Professor N. C. Paulescu (1869–1931), applying the theological framework of John 8:44 to the Jewish question:

The three of them—the Talmud, the Kahal, and Freemasonry—use, in order to remain in the dark, a scabrous and accursed means, namely the lie. But the lie has a mortal enemy, namely the truth. For truth is the distinctive trait of Christianity. Christ said: "I am the truth" and that is why His doctrine is in execration by Israel. The lie, on the contrary, characterizes what is called the spirit of evil or of the Devil. Thus Jesus, speaking to the Hebrews, said to them: "You are of your father the devil and the lusts of your father it is your will to do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and standeth not in the truth because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie he speaketh of his own for he is a liar and the father thereof."

What distinguished the Legionary movement from other interwar nationalisms was this theological register. The program of spiritual formation was built on hesychast foundations. The *Nest Leader's Manual*, a practical and spiritual guidebook used by the Legionnaires, teaches that wars are won by spiritual forces, by prayer drawing from heaven the blessing of God upon those who still struggle. The new man the Legionary school aimed to produce was a spiritual warrior: "a man in whom all the possibilities of human grandeur that are implanted by God in the blood of our people be developed to the maximum." Resistance to hostile power was inseparable from the formation of the Orthodox person capable of sustaining it.

Codreanu was arrested without warrant in April 1938. His *Prison Notes*, written on wrapping paper with a pencil stub barely holdable between his fingers, in a cell where the sun entered for brief moments toward five o'clock in the afternoon, are among the most affecting documents of modern Christian witness. His Paschal prayer, written in solitary confinement on the Sunday of the Resurrection, asks God to give strength to the living, victory over their enemies, the blossoming of Christian and Legionary Romania, and the return of his nation to God. It ends with three words: *Christ Is Risen*. He was assassinated in November 1938 by strangulation

along with thirteen of his commanders, whose bodies were subsequently treated with quicklime and concrete poured over their mass grave to erase the evidence.

If Codreanu gives Romanian Orthodox resistance its active and formative dimension, Valeriu Gafencu (1921–1952) gives it its contemplative culmination. Arrested at twenty and dead of tuberculosis in Communist captivity eleven years later, Gafencu had acquired through sustained practice of the Jesus Prayer the gift of unceasing prayer, even during his sleep. During the night of his last Christmas, he reported a vision of the Mother of God: "My Son will be victorious… Be bold, the world belongs to Christ!" Two weeks before his death, he told his companions the exact date of his departure. On February 18, 1952, after confessing and receiving Holy Communion, in a state of angelic calm, he died. Ioan Ianolide testified: "I believe that I was in heaven. I also believe that I was beside Christ, because Christ was present in Valeriu."

The Securitate subsequently prosecuted twenty-nine of those who had known Gafencu at Târgu-Ocna in a 1959 trial of the "mystical Legionnaire group." Their documented crimes—giving food to the weakest among the sick, cleaning wounds, praying, singing carols, learning texts from Holy Scripture—were construed as "subversive Legionnaire activity" disguised as "mysticism." The regime recognized, correctly, that the prayer of the heart was its most dangerous adversary.

Russia

The Soviet assault on the Russian Church lasted seven decades and set itself against nothing less than Orthodox sacramental civilization—church closures and desecrations, mass clerical executions, forced collectivization of monastery lands, the infiltration of hierarchies, and the deliberate engineering of a generation raised without the sacraments.

The assault was directed at Orthodox Christianity with a specificity the documentary record makes unmistakable. Workers at Kronstadt petitioned to note that guard duty had been assigned exclusively to Orthodox priests while "not a Jewish rabbi, not a Muslim mullah, not a Catholic pastor, not a Protestant pastor was put to use." Workers in Archangelsk published in *Pravda* a petition describing Orthodox churches being "profaned, defiled, plundered—exclusively Orthodox churches, never synagogues." Solzhenitsyn, in *Two Hundred Years Together* (2001–2002), documented the overrepresentation of Jewish figures in the revolutionary leadership driving this persecution. D. S. Pasmanik, a Jewish communist historian, acknowledged it without hostility: the Jewish renegades "occupied too great a place among the Bolshevik commissars." Lenin explained the mechanism to Simon Dimantstein: the restructuring of the State apparatus succeeded "exclusively thanks to this pool of new civil servants—lucid, educated, and reasonably competent." The persecution was not incidentally anti-religious; it was directed at Orthodox Christianity with a precision that confirms, from inside the revolution itself, the judgment Saint John Chrysostom had made fifteen centuries earlier.

Sergei Bulgakov (1871–1944), a former Marxist who returned to Orthodoxy and was eventually ordained to the priesthood, wrote from exile in Paris in 1941: "In the USSR, the persecution of

Christians surpassed in violence and amplitude all previous persecutions known throughout History… The persecution of Christians found its most zealous actors among Jewish commissars of militant atheism." Those who had rejected Christ had found in the atheist state the most efficient means yet of destroying what Holy Rus had been built to preserve.

Fr. Seraphim Rose's books, distributed in typewritten *samizdat* across the Soviet Union, reached souls by the thousands. His biographer Hieromonk Damascene records that they spoke openly to people in Russia against the spirit of international godlessness, making them unashamed of their ancient Faith. The faith transmitted through the sacraments for a thousand years proved impossible to destroy by seventy years of systematic state violence.

Palestine, Lebanon, and Beyond

The same theological logic is operative now, against apostolic communities whose character is beyond dispute.

The modern state of Israel is not the continuation of biblical Israel but a modern nationalist project. Shlomo Sand, Professor of History at Tel Aviv University, demonstrated in *The Invention of the Jewish People* (2008) that the mass exile from Judea in 70 AD—the founding narrative of diaspora Jewish identity—is a historical myth unsupported by the Roman administrative record. The Jewish populations of the diaspora grew through proselytization and through the conversion of the Khazar empire, a Turkic-Hunnic kingdom that adopted Judaism as its state religion in the eighth century and dissolved after the Mongol invasions, providing the probable demographic foundation for Ashkenazi Jewry in Eastern Europe. The promises to Abraham are fulfilled in Christ, leaving no ethnic remainder and therefore no territorial claim that survives Christological supersessionism.

The military operations against Gaza, Iran, and Lebanon are, within the framework of those conducting them, understood as applications of halakhic principle. Shahak documented the rabbinical discussion of whether Palestinians should be treated as Amalekites—the biblical enemy the Torah commands to exterminate "until the memory of them is blotted out under heaven" (Deuteronomy 25:19)—and the rulings issued in response. The 1973 army chaplaincy pamphlet *Tohar Ha-Neshek*, published by the Central Region Command, declared it "permitted and indeed obligatory according to the Halakha" to kill Arab civilians who appear harmless when Israeli forces are advancing. The connection between these principles and the conduct of the current wars is direct and doctrinal, operative in military chaplaincy, in rabbinical rulings distributed to soldiers, and in the public statements of senior Israeli religious and governmental figures today.

The Church of Jerusalem, whose liturgy has been celebrated in Arabic since before Islam existed, and the Patriarchate of Antioch, tracing its succession to the first generation of Christian missionaries, are apostolic communities being destroyed in the name of promises that the Orthodox Tradition has always understood as fulfilled and superseded in Christ. Western churches that have abandoned the apostolic inheritance have nothing theologically coherent to say. Christian Zionism follows directly from the Reformation's inflation of the Old Testament, through Calvinist covenant theology, producing what Guyénot accurately describes as

structurally Yahwism bearing a cross. Runciman's verdict on the Crusading movement—"the Holy War itself was nothing more than a long act of intolerance in the name of God, which is the sin against the Holy Ghost"—applies without modification to what is being conducted now.

VIII. The Answer — Death to the World

Through all of this, the Orthodox Tradition held the apostolic inheritance intact, maintained its canonical boundaries, and produced persons who bore in their own bodies the testimony that the uncreated life is real, available, and beyond the power of the world to efface. What such an availability demands is the question on which the argument closes.

The political answer has been tried. The most determined attempt in modern history to resolve the Jewish question by force of arms produced not resolution but catastrophe—men whose aims were admirable, who understood the enemy with clarity, who loved their people with genuine sacrifice, and who took up the sword and perished by it, as the Lord had declared. Their failure was not of nerve or of analysis but of means. The weapons of the world, deployed against a spiritual adversary on the terrain he controls, do not merely fall short—they consolidate his power and furnish him with instruments of victimization he has wielded without interruption ever since. The monks of Mount Athos understood the spirit of those times without question or apology: during the Second World War, the Holy Mountain appealed to Hitler directly for protection against Bolshevism, correctly identifying in Soviet Communism the spirit of the Antichrist—a spirit wearing the mask of liberation while prosecuting the most systematic destruction of Christian sacramental life the world had yet seen. A portrait of Hitler hung in the Hilandar monastery as a mark of that recognition. The monks were right about what Communism was. No political instrument could answer it. The nationalist project in all its forms sought to secure for Christian civilization an earthly permanence—a recovered golden age, a people preserved against the long assault of history. But this is precisely the vision the enemies of Christ have always projected onto this world: an earthly king, an earthly kingdom, all nations prostrate before a temporal throne. To meet that vision with a mirror image is to fight on the enemy's ground, by the enemy's logic, toward an end that was never ours to pursue. The purpose for which man was made is not the establishment of any kingdom of this age.

To name both the enemy and the remedy requires clarity about terms. When the Tradition speaks of the world and commands Death to the World, it invokes no Gnostic contempt for creation, which God pronounced good, nor any rejection of the human beings within it. But precision is required here, because the sentimentality that takes the universal dignity of creatures as grounds for universal spiritual equivalence is itself one of the enemy's most effective weapons—a softening of the mind that renders it incapable of the discrimination on which salvation depends. Every soul was fashioned in the image of God, and every soul bears the disfigurement of the fall. That disfigurement is the same in the wealthy and the poor, in the Christian and the atheist, in the baptized and the unbaptized, and it demands the same remedy in all of them. That remedy was never sentiment and never tolerance. It is the Cross, and the life of warfare the Cross inaugurates. The tears of every child are not an invitation to a religion of consolation; they are a confession of the fall, and a call to the only struggle that addresses it.

What the Tradition means by the world is what Saint Isaac the Syrian defined as "the general name for all the passions"—and further: "When we wish to call the passions by a common name, we call them the world. But when we wish to distinguish them by their special names, we call them passions." Death to the World implies no Gnostic contempt for existence and nothing of the aestheticized despair that sometimes borrows ascetic clothing. It is the death of the passions—the very mechanisms through which the prince of this world, the adversary whom Christ named the ruler of this age, keeps his dominion over souls made for God.

The institutions in which the anti-Christian world takes its most fully realized form are controlled, whether by coordination or by the deep congruence of a shared ancestral and theological orientation, almost exclusively by those who have rejected the Logos—working in tandem or in parallel, with their own internal disputes about method, but oriented by doctrine and inheritance toward the same ends. The financial architecture that enslaves through debt and manufactures perpetual anxiety; the media apparatus that colonizes the imagination and renders sustained attention to God nearly impossible; the pornographic culture that degrades the body, corrupts eros in its proper orientation toward the divine, and chains the *nous* to the most debasing of the passions; the therapeutic apparatus constructed on the Freudian inversion of the soul's true disorder, which seeks to remedy that disorder through the appetites that constitute it—offering the hypersexualized and the demonic as liberation from the very captivity they deepen—these are not symptoms of decline but weapons, deployed with precision against the faculty through which man is capable of God. A soul habituated to pornographic imagery cannot pray. A mind colonized by the perpetual noise of commercial media cannot achieve the stillness in which the uncreated energies are received. An economy of debt produces the anxiety that Scripture identifies as the specific enemy of trust in divine Providence. Saint Paisius names the three enemies plainly—the world, the flesh, and the devil—and identifies them as a single integrated warfare, each reinforcing the others, all directed at the same target. The rejection of the Logos does not end at theology: it produces hostile institutions, and those institutions are the world in its most precise patristic meaning.

Against this, Saint Seraphim of Sarov declared the only aim adequate to the situation: the acquisition of the Holy Spirit of God. Prayer, fasting, vigil, almsgiving—not ends in themselves but instruments by which the grace that constitutes the sole purpose of the Christian life is obtained. The foolish virgins possessed virtue and lacked the one thing needful: the grace of the All-Holy Spirit, without which no one is or can be saved. The door of the bridal chamber is human death, and it does not remain open indefinitely. "In whatsoever I find you, in that will I judge you," says the Lord. If the soul that acquires the Holy Spirit illumines those around it—as a candle gives light without diminishing itself—then the soul that yields to the passions, that accommodates the world and its prince, darkens not only itself but every soul within its reach. This is the true cost of every capitulation to the weapons the enemy has placed at such careful disposal. Each surrender participates in the darkening of others, and the radius of that darkening is wider than we suppose.

The answer is the death of the old man and the acquisition of the new—not through political organization or the capture of earthly institutions, however urgent those contests may feel in a given hour, but through the slow, costly, and in its own way more heroic labor of *orthopraxia* rightly understood: the struggle against the passions as warfare against the enemy's own

weapons, the restoration of the *nous* through prayer and fasting and the sacramental life of the Church, the daily dying to the world that Saint Isaac names as the only condition of true life. Gafencu dying in prayer at thirty years old had defeated the forces arrayed against his civilization more completely than any army could. Codreanu ended his last letter not with a strategy but with the Paschal proclamation—because he understood, in the end, what the only victory is, and to Whom it belongs.

The tradition that has always known this, and has transmitted it without interruption through every century of assault, remains present and intact. It does not require the world's weapons. It requires only to be lived—and to be lived now, in whatsoever state the Lord will find us.

APPENDIX: On the Chronology of the First Millennium

Chronology is itself a historical artifact. The dates that organize our picture of antiquity and the early Christian centuries were not transmitted continuously from the events they record; they were constructed, revised, and standardized in identifiable places and by identifiable hands. Isaac Newton devoted decades to chronological inquiry, and his posthumous *Chronology of Ancient Kingdoms Amended* (1728) argued that the received timelines of Greek, Egyptian, and Near Eastern antiquity were inflated by several centuries. A Russian scholarly tradition extending from Nikolai Morozov (1854–1946) through the later reconstructions of Anatoly Fomenko has pressed the same line of inquiry into the first millennium AD. The timeline beneath Western historical consciousness is a constructed instrument assembled from sources of variable reliability, and the conditions of its construction merit inspection.

A. Documentary Forgeries

The starting point is established in the main text. The Donation of Constantine, exposed as a forgery by Lorenzo Valla in the fifteenth century, underwrote the papal claim to temporal sovereignty for eight centuries before its documentary fraudulence became undeniable. The Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals—a vast corpus of fabricated papal letters and canons assembled in the Frankish church around 850—represent one of the most ambitious programs of institutional forgery in Western history; Klaus Zechiel-Eckes's forensic analysis of the manuscript evidence demonstrated that the forgers worked systematically, drawing on genuine canonical collections and interpolating fabricated material with deliberate care. Accepted as authentic throughout the medieval Latin West for nearly seven centuries, the Decretals shaped canon law, papal theory, and the institutional self-understanding of Western Christendom at every level. The papal biography of Constantine attributed to Eusebius of Caesarea—the *Vita Constantini*—has been a subject of sustained scholarly dispute concerning its authenticity and integrity; its modern editors acknowledge that the text has proved "extremely controversial," with scholars divided between those who accept it as substantially genuine and those who regard it as a later composition or heavily reworked source.

These three documents hold the load-bearing positions of the Latin West's self-description: the legitimacy of papal authority, the conversion of the first Christian emperor, the character of the early Church. When a civilization's account of itself rests on documents demonstrably or plausibly fraudulent at their foundations, the wider record merits a sharper scrutiny than it has

traditionally received. Anthony Grafton, in *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book* (2009), observes "close parallels between the activities of Eusebius and Trithemius"—the latter a Renaissance abbot with a documented facility for forgery—and describes the parallel as "a deep structure of Christian scholarship."

B. Chronological Construction: Scaliger

The unified chronology within which Western history is read today was not inherited from antiquity. It was constructed in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries by Joseph Justus Scaliger (1540–1609), a French Protestant philologist whose *Opus de emendatione temporum* (1583) and *Thesaurus temporum* (1606) synthesized biblical, classical, Egyptian, and Near Eastern chronologies into a single coherent framework. Scaliger's achievement was genuine: he established the Julian Period as a universal dating instrument and produced the first rigorous attempt to align diverse chronological traditions on a common axis.

It was also a reconstruction. Scaliger worked from manuscript sources of variable provenance, harmonized where the sources disagreed, and supplied by calculation what the sources did not contain. His successors—Denis Pétau (Petavius), the Jesuit chronologists, and the Bollandists—refined and propagated the framework across Catholic Europe through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. What is now received as the standard chronology of antiquity is, to a degree rarely acknowledged, the work of their hands: not an archive transmitted from the ancient world but an early modern synthesis, inherited by every generation since and taught without serious re-examination of the ground it stands on.

C. Historical Compression: The Phantom Centuries

A current of twentieth- and twenty-first-century scholarship has argued that the received chronology overstates the length of the first millennium AD by a period variously estimated at two to four centuries. The German archaeologist Gunnar Heinsohn (1943–2023) approached the question stratigraphically. Examining Roman-period cities across the Mediterranean, he observed that no known site exhibits the three distinct archaeological strata the standard timeline requires: Roman Antiquity, Late Antiquity, and the Early Middle Ages. Cities show one continuous Roman stratum. The three designated periods, he argued, are not successive phases but different scholarly labels applied to a single period, artificially extended across seven centuries where the physical record suggests fewer. The so-called Dark Ages—the centuries between the fall of Rome and the Carolingian renewal—leave almost no coherent archaeological signature. What they leave, Heinsohn argues, is a documentary record produced by institutions with strong motives for extending the timeline: a papacy that needed centuries of precedent to legitimize its claims, and a Frankish court that needed an ancient lineage to justify its Roman inheritance.

The Swedish dendrochronologists Lars-Åke Larsson and Petra Ossowski Larsson reached a convergent conclusion through independent work on tree-ring sequences. In "Redating West-Roman History" (2016), they identified a 207-year segment in Hollstein's standard European oak chronology that appears to repeat—a direct indication, on their reading, that phantom centuries have been inserted into the received timeline. They document what they term "twin

events" separated by roughly 232 years in Eastern and Western Roman records. The most striking of these concerns the plague. Procopius of Caesarea, writing in Justinian's reign, describes a catastrophic darkening of the sun in 536 followed by bubonic plague from 541 onward—events confirmed by modern dendrochronology and DNA analysis of burial sites. Eusebius of Caesarea, writing in what the standard chronology places as Constantine's period, describes an epidemic with symptoms consistent with bubonic plague, dated by modern scholars to around 310—exactly 232 years earlier. Both historians came from Caesarea Palestinae.

Larsson and Ossowski Larsson read this as the same catastrophe separated by inserted centuries. The interpretation is contested, and none of the revisionist arguments is settled; but they are no longer arguments confined to textual criticism. Physical evidence—stratigraphic, dendrochronological, climatological—has begun to press against the chronology inherited from the seventeenth century.

D. Institutional Narrative Control and the Standardization of Time

What made the standardization of the Scaligerian framework possible was the existence of a centralized ecclesiastical apparatus capable of imposing uniformity across the Latin West. The Roman Curia, the Jesuit educational network, and the missionary orders constituted an administrative reach sufficient to propagate a single chronological framework across a continent and, eventually, across much of the globe. No comparable centralization existed elsewhere, and no comparable uniformity emerged. The Orthodox East retained its own reckoning; the Islamic world counted from the Hijra; China, India, Persia, and the pre-Columbian Americas each preserved indigenous systems. Global chronological alignment is a historically recent achievement, not an inheritance from antiquity.

The same institutional reach shaped narrative as well as chronology. Anthony Kaldellis, in *Romanland: Ethnicity and Empire in Byzantium* (2019), has argued that the standard Western account of Byzantium—a declining remnant of Roman antiquity, marginal to the main current of Christian history—is a distortion produced by centuries of deliberate redaction. Byzantium was, until 1453, the largest, wealthiest, and most continuously constituted Christian polity on earth, with constitutional arrangements older and more genuinely republican than anything medieval Western feudalism could approximate. Its relegation to a footnote in the received narrative was accomplished not by accident but by an institutional machinery with motive and means: Rome and Aachen, each claiming the Roman inheritance, possessed the ecclesiastical authority to standardize a version of the record in which Constantinople's centrality was reduced to administrative residue.

The divergence is not only historical. The Julian calendar, abandoned in Catholic Europe at the Gregorian reform of 1582 and in Protestant lands across the following two centuries, remained in civil use in Orthodox Russia until 1918 and is maintained for liturgical purposes by the Russian, Serbian, Georgian, and Jerusalem Patriarchates to the present day. The coexistence of multiple calendars within living memory indicates that the uniform temporal framework Western civilization now takes for granted is the product of specific institutional pressures operating across specific centuries. It is not a natural condition.

The Orthodox Tradition stands outside this documentary apparatus altogether. The ecumenical councils, the patristic consensus, and the continuous sacramental and ascetic life of the Church require no Eusebian warrant and no Scaligerian scaffolding. They were transmitted generation to generation, council to council, elder to disciple—in a mode that does not depend on the documentary apparatus of the Latin West, and cannot be disturbed by its reexamination.

The question the revisionists force is one historiography was always obliged to ask: by whom are historical dates established, under what conditions, and in the service of what interests. It is not a new question. It is only a quieter one than the field of experts has cared to hear.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archimandrite George, Abbot of the Holy Monastery of Saint Gregorios, Mount Athos. *Theosis: The True Purpose of Human Life*. 4th ed. Mount Athos: Holy Monastery of Saint Gregorios, 2006.

Athanasius of Alexandria (c. 296–373). *On the Incarnation*. Translated by Sister Penelope Lawson. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1953.

Bakan, David. *Sigmund Freud and the Jewish Mystical Tradition*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1958.

Brianchaninov, Ignatius (1807–1867). *The Field: Cultivating Salvation*. Jordanville, NY: Holy Trinity Monastery, 2016.

Brown, Peter. *The Rise of Western Christendom: Triumph and Diversity, A.D. 200–1000*. 10th anniversary ed. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013.

Bulgakov, Sergei (1871–1944). *Khristianstvo i evreiskii vopros* [Christianity and the Jewish Question]. Paris: YMCA Press, 1991.

Chrysostom, John (c. 347–407). *Discourses Against Judaizing Christians*. Translated by Paul W. Harkins. Fathers of the Church, vol. 68. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1979.

Codreanu, Corneliu Zelea (1899–1938). *For My Legionaries* (*Pentru legionari*). Translated by Faust Bradescu and Moshe Kohn. Reedy, WV: Liberty Bell Publications, 1990.

———. *The Nest Leader's Manual*. N.p., 1933.

———. *Prison Notes*. N.p., 1938.

Dalton, Thomas. *Eternal Strangers: Critical Views of Jews and Judaism through the Ages*. Uckfield: Castle Hill Publishers, 2020.

Damascene, Hieromonk. *Father Seraphim Rose: His Life and Works*. Platina, CA: St. Herman of Alaska Brotherhood, 2003.

Daniélou, Jean. *Philo of Alexandria*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2014.

Damick, Andrew Stephen. *Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy: Finding the Way to Christ in a Complicated Religious Landscape*. Chesterton, IN: Ancient Faith Publishing, 2011.

Eisenmenger, Johann Andreas (1654–1704). *Entdecktes Judenthum*. Königsberg, 1711.

Elder Ephraim, former Abbot of the Holy Monastery of Philotheou. *The Art of Salvation*. Roscoe, NY: Saint Nektarios Monastery Publications, 2014.

Florovsky, Georges (1893–1979). *Bible, Church, Tradition: An Eastern Orthodox View*. Belmont, MA: Nordland Publishing, 1972.

Fomenko, Anatoly (b. 1945). *History: Fiction or Science?* Vols. 1–7. Paris and London: Delamere Publishing, 2003–2014.

The Saint of the Prisons: Notes on the Life of Valeriu Gafencu. Collected by Monk Moise. Aiud: Schitul Înălţarea Sfintei Cruci, 2014.

Grafton, Anthony. *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius, and the Library of Caesarea*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006.

Goodenough, Erwin R. *The Theology of Justin Martyr*. Jena: Frommann, 1923.

Guyénot, Laurent (b. 1960). *From Yahweh to Zion: Three Thousand Years of Exile*. Lone Rock, WI: Sifting and Winnowing Books, 2018.

———. *The Papal Curse: The Medieval Origins of Europe's Disunity*. London: Arktos, 2026.

———. *Anno Domini: A Short History of the First Millennium AD*. Published under the pseudonym "The First Millennium Revisionist." Collected from *The Unz Review*, 2022–2023.

———. "Is Christianity the Whore of Israel?" Substack, 2024.

———. "Hacking the Logos." Substack, February 2026.

———. "The Vampire of the Empire." Substack, March 2026.

———. "The Christianization of Knowledge." Substack, March 2026.

———. Essays in *The Unz Review*: "Byzantine Revisionism Unlocks World History" (2023); "A Short History of Civilization" (2023); "The Constantine Hoax and the Forgery of Western History" (2024); and related essays on Judaization, the Crusades, Marranism, and revisionist chronology.

Heinsohn, Gunnar (1943–2023). Writings on first-millennium stratigraphy and chronological compression, collected in various proceedings of the *Chronology & Catastrophism Workshop*.

Hierotheos, Metropolitan of Nafpaktos. *Orthodox Psychotherapy: The Science of the Fathers*. Translated by Esther Williams. Levadia: Birth of the Theotokos Monastery, 1994.

Jones, E. Michael (b. 1948). *The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit and Its Impact on World History*. South Bend, IN: Fidelity Press, 2008.

———. *The Catholic Church and the Jews*. Edited by John Beaumont. South Bend, IN: Fidelity Press, 2015.

———. *Logos Rising: A History of Ultimate Reality*. South Bend, IN: Fidelity Press, 2020.

Justin Martyr (c. 100–165). *Dialogue with Trypho*. In *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 1. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1885.

Kaldellis, Anthony. *Byzantium Unbound*. Leeds: ARC Humanities Press, 2019.

———. *Romanland: Ethnicity and Empire in Byzantium*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2019.

Kelly, J.N.D. *Early Christian Doctrines*. 4th ed. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1968.

Larsson, Lars-Åke, and Petra Ossowski Larsson. “Redating West-Roman History.” *Chronology & Catastrophism Workshop*, 2016.

Letteney, Mark. *The Christianization of Knowledge in Late Antiquity: Intellectual and Material Transformations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023.

Lossky, Vladimir (1903–1958). *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1976.

MacDonald, Kevin. *The Culture of Critique*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998.

Maimonides, Moses (1138–1204). *Mishneh Torah*. Translated by Eliyahu Touger. New York: Moznaim Publishing, 1986–1997.

Melito of Sardis (died c. 180). *Peri Pascha* (*On the Passover*). Translated by Alistair Stewart-Sykes. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2001.

Meyendorff, John (1926–1992). *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes*. New York: Fordham University Press, 1974.

Moore, Robert I. *The First European Revolution, c. 970–1215*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2000.

Morozov, Nikolai (1854–1946). *Khristos* [Christ]. 7 vols. Moscow-Leningrad: Gosizdat, 1924–1932.

Newton, Isaac (1642–1727). *The Chronology of Ancient Kingdoms Amended*. London: J. Tonson, 1728.

Origen (c. 185–253). *Against Celsus*. In *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 4. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1885.

Palamas, Gregory (1296–1359). *Apodictic Treatises on the Procession of the Holy Spirit*. Translated by Christopher Moody. Richfield Springs, NY: Uncut Mountain Press, 2023.

Rose, Seraphim (1934–1982). *Orthodoxy and the Religion of the Future*. Platina, CA: St. Herman of Alaska Brotherhood, 1975.

Runciman, Steven (1903–2000). *A History of the Crusades*. 3 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951–1954.

Sand, Shlomo (b. 1946). *The Invention of the Jewish People*. Translated by Yael Lotan. London: Verso, 2009.

Scaliger, Joseph Justus (1540–1609). *Opus de emendatione temporum*. Paris, 1583.

———. *Thesaurus temporum*. Leiden, 1606.

Scholem, Gershom (1897–1982). *Sabbatai Ṣevi: The Mystical Messiah, 1626–1676*. Translated by R. J. Zwi Werblowsky. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1973.

Seraphim of Sarov (1754–1833). *Little Russian Philokalia*, vol. 1. Translated by the New Sarov Hermitage. Platina, CA: St. Herman of Alaska Brotherhood, 1980.

Shahak, Israel (1933–2001). *Jewish History, Jewish Religion: The Weight of Three Thousand Years*. London: Pluto Press, 1994.

Slavet, Eliza. *Racial Fever: Freud and the Jewish Question*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2009.

Solzhenitsyn, Aleksandr (1918–2008). *Dvesti let vmeste* [Two Hundred Years Together]. 2 vols. Moscow: Russkiy Put’, 2001–2002.

Symeon the New Theologian (949–1022). *The Discourses*. Translated by C. J. deCatanzaro. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1980.

The Synodikon of Orthodoxy. English translation. Aiud: Schitul Înălţarea Sfintei Cruci, 2014.

Tertullian (c. 155–240). *An Answer to the Jews* (*Adversus Judaeos*). In *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 3. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1885.

Theophan the Recluse (1815–1894). *The Path to Salvation: A Manual of Spiritual Transformation*. Translated by Fr. Seraphim Rose. Safford, AZ: St. Paisius Monastery, 2006.

Valla, Lorenzo (1407–1457). *On the Donation of Constantine*. Translated by G. W. Bowersock. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007.

Velimirović, Nikolai (1880–1956). *The Prologue of Ohrid: Lives of Saints, Hymns, Reflections and Homilies for Every Day of the Year*. Translated by Fr. T. Timothy Tepsić. Alhambra, CA: Sebastian Press, 2012.

Veniamin, Christopher (b. 1958). *The Orthodox Interpretation of Holy Scripture: St. Gregory Palamas and the Key to Understanding the Bible*. Dalton, PA: Mount Thabor Publishing, 2013.

Yovel, Yirmiyahu. *The Other Within: The Marranos, Split Identity and Emerging Modernity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009.

Zechiel-Eckes, Klaus. “Ein Blick in Pseudoisidors Werkstatt.” *Francia* 28 (2001): 37–90.